

9

REPORT,

VINDICATING THE TORONTO BOARD
OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES FROM THE AT-
TACK OF THE CHIEF SUPERINTENDENT,
DR. RYERSON, IN HIS "SPECIAL RE-
PORT" SUBMITTED TO THE LEGISLA-
TURE, MAY, 1858.

REPORT.

To THE CHARTERED AND INCORPORATED
SCHOOL TRUSTEES

Extracts from the Minutes of the B. S. T.

June 2nd, 1858.

Mr. Tully having brought under the notice of the Board certain passages contained in the "Special Report" of the Chief Superintendent for C. W. (Dr. Ryerson), reflecting upon the School Trustees, It was Resolved,—That the Acting Local Superintendent (G. A. Barber) be instructed to furnish to this Board, at its next meeting, a Report embodying the names of all those Teachers who have been in the employment of the Board, who have been in attendance at the Normal School as students, and who hold certificates from that Institution—and such further information, with reference to the subject, as he may consider advisable to submit.

December 15th, 1858.

Resolved,—That the late Local Superintendent's Report in the matter of Dr. Ryerson's attack upon the Board, be now adopted, and that the same be referred to a Special Committee for the purpose of having the same printed, in the most efficient and public manner, at the expense of the Board.

REPORT.

To THE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD
OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES.

GENTLEMEN,—

In accordance with the Resolution moved at your last meeting by Mr. Tully, and adopted by the Board, I beg to submit the following Report upon that portion of the Chief Superintendent's Special Report on the Separate School Provisions of the School Law of Upper Canada, recently published (May, 1858), in which that official directly charges Toronto with having "ignored the Normal School, though established within its limits," and further asserts, in unqualified terms, that "not a Normal School teacher has been placed in charge of one of the Common Schools of the city; and only two or three employed in subordinate positions,"—thereupon founding the sarcasm that if our City Schools have not, as yet, accomplished all that was hoped for from their establishment, the want of success is to be attributed to our having, as asserted, "ignored the Normal School"—and further, making an invidious comparison between Hamilton and Toronto, as regards their respective common school operations—praising Hamilton as "*an illustration of the Provincial Normal and Model School System,*" at the expense of Toronto, whose school system is vilified and censured as being "old," and behind-hand, except only as regards "school houses and school furniture."

Had these assertions been put forward in a general manner and in an ordinary Report, they might have been looked upon, at the worst, as accidental mistakes, which it would have been quite enough to have merely set right. But when misstatements, such as these, against the common schools of Toronto, have been deliberately advanced, as it would really seem, to subserve the purposes of a particular Institution or System, for which so much is claimed and indeed exacted—and have further been embodied in a Special Report, which has been printed and circulated by thousands at the public expense, and by authority of Parliament—it becomes necessary to enter at some length upon the duty of replying to and refuting them—although in doing so I shall limit my remarks, as much as possible, to facts and figures which will, however, speak for themselves.

The Common School System came first into *actual* operation in Toronto in 1844, when the city was divided into school sections, and the schools were maintained (exclusive of the Government grant and an equal amount of city assessment,) by a rate-bill levied on the parents of children attending the schools—each section (of which at first there were 12 and afterwards 15) having its own local trustees (3 in number), who appointed the teacher, and controlled all school matters, within their own respective sections.

This mode of carrying on the school affairs of this city continued in force until July, 1847, at which time the law was amended, by placing the whole control and management of the schools in the hands of a Board of Trustees, appointed by the city corporation.

At the close of 1850 another change was made in the School Law by the 13 and 14 Victoria, chap. 48, and the elective principle was made an element in School affairs—each ward in the city was, under the, again, amended law, entitled to return two (2) Local Trustees to represent its School interests at the Board, which was now invested with corporate powers and greatly enlarged authority. The Elective Board initiated its proceedings in October, 1850, but did not exercise any direct control over the Schools until the new year, 1851—and the elective system still remains in force.

As the Normal and Model Schools did not exist during the early period of School Sections and Local Trustees, I shall pass on to the period when, in July, 1847, the responsibility of the City School System was in charge of the Board nominated by the Corporation; the establishment of a Provincial Normal and Model School, and the formation of a City Board, having been cotemporaneous.

During said period, namely from July, 1847, to December, 81, 1850, the then Board of School Trustees appointed, upon *my official Report*, which *in a great measure was based upon the recommendation of the Normal School authorities*, the following persons, the same being Normal School Teachers, and holding Normal School certificates, *to the charge of a school* in the different sections, namely : Mr. David Clyde, Mr. Robert McLelland, Mr. Robert Robinson, Mr. David George, Mr. A. McKinnon, and Mr. James Carruthers,—who formed six (6) out of the nine (9) *new appointments*, of that grade, made during this period; while seven or eight Teachers, who had been

previously employed during the School Section period, were continued in office by the Board.

Proceeding onwards from January, 1851, when the duties and powers of the Elective Board came into practical effect, we find that the system of School Sections was abandoned, and the principle of centralization adopted, shortly after the Board was organized—the three new Central School Houses first erected came into practical operation early in 1853; the principle was soon afterwards further extended; and the three others since erected were opened in 1855.

These new School arrangements naturally required many additional Teachers; and during the period the Elective Board has had the management of the City Schools, viz., from January, 1851, say to December, 1857, a period of seven years, *thirty-six* (36), and not "two or three," Normal School Teachers have been appointed to situations in the City Schools; and I submit a return of the *names* of the Normal School Teachers, recognized as such by that Institution, who have been so appointed—and the *position* those teachers occupied.
 1st. Male department—Head Masters "*in charge*" two, viz.: Mr. J. W. Shaw, firstly to the Park School, and afterwards to Victoria Street School; and Mr. J. Carruthers, George Street School.

N.B.—Messrs. Brooke and Hunter attended the Normal School part of a session, viz., when the City Schools were closed, 1848-49—six months in each year—but they cannot properly be taken as Normal School Teachers, and are therefore not designated as such in this return.

Assistant Masters, 3—viz.: Mr. Robt. Mc-

Caus
Hack

Ju
Miss

nedy
A. F

R
ters

Assi

2r

char

Loui

Stre

Miss

Miss

N

Sch

sion

fica

S

—v

cha

Sch

Sch

Mis

Ho

L.

5;

in

ant

Causland, Mr. Thos. Baxter, and Mr. Wm. Hacket.

Junior Assistants, 8—viz: Miss M. J. Keown, Miss A. Richards, Miss J. Robinson, Miss E. Kennedy, Miss L. Piper, Miss Jane Mowatt, Miss A. Foggin, and Miss A. Shennick.

Recapitulation—Male Department—Head Masters “*in charge*,” 2; Assistant Masters, 3; Junior Assistant (Females), 8—total, 13.

2nd Female Department—Head Mistresses “*in charge*,” 5—viz: Mrs. Corbett, Phœbe Street and Louisa Street Schools; Miss F. Bethell, George Street School; Miss A. McLean, the Park School; Miss S. B. Quinn, Louisa Street School, and Miss Borthwick, Victoria Street School.

N. B.—Miss Smythe, of the George Street School, attended the Normal School for two sessions, but, from some unexplained cause, her certificate did not reach her.

Senior Assistants, acting as Head Mistresses, 2—viz: Miss E. Robinson, John Street School, and Miss F. Gordon, her successor.

Senior Assistants, (where a Head Mistress is in charge), 2—viz: Miss M. Hoig, George Street School, and Miss M. A. Kennedy, Louisa Street School.

Junior Assistants, 9—viz: Miss Emma Arnold, Miss Emily Clark, Miss Josephine Clark, Miss E. Hoig, Miss E. Campbell, Miss M. Wilkes, Miss M. L. Williams, Miss Higgins, and Miss Bowes.

Recapitulation.—Head Mistresses “*in charge*”, 5; Senior Assistants acting as Head Mistresses *in charge*, 2: Senior Assistants, 2; Junior Assistants, 9; total, 18.

Occasional or Monitor Teachers, (in either de-

partment), 5—viz: Miss McLellan, Miss A. M. Holmes, Miss S. Bethell, Miss J. Steacey, and Miss C. M. Churchill.

Summary.—Normal School Teachers appointed to the City Schools, viz.: 1847 to Dec. 1850, 6 males; Jan., 1851, to Dec., 1857, 18 male department, 18 female department; and 5 occasional and monitor; total, 42.

In addition to the foregoing, who have been actually employed, I may mention that Mr. W. J. Kelly, of the Normal School, was appointed Head Master "*in charge*," of the Park School, as successor to Mr. Brown, although he did not think proper to enter upon the duties; and Miss Coote and Miss Whiddecombe, both Normal School Teachers, were appointed Senior Assistants, acting as Head Mistresses; but being at the time otherwise engaged, they could not avail of the appointment.

And further, in addition to the foregoing, I may also mention that the following six (6) Teachers have received appointments during the present year, 1858, and are now on the regular staff of the schools, viz.: Mrs. Lawdor, Head Mistress "*in charge*," Phœbe Street School; Miss S. Hamilton, Miss J. Armstrong, Miss M. A. Churchill, Miss Agnew, Monitor Teachers, and Miss C. Ryan, Temporary—*every one of whom is a Normal School Teacher.*

The whole number of *new* appointments made by the elective Board during the period of 7 years it has existed, has been 64, of whom 36 have been Normal School teachers, and of these, instead of "*not one*," as asserted by Dr. Ryerson, there have been 2 head-masters *in charge* of a central school (not taking Mr. Kelly's appointment into

A. M.
ey, and
pointed
1850, 6
depart-
asional

e been
W. J.
Head
succes-
nk pro-
ote and
achers,
s Head
se en-
ent.

I may
achers
resent
of the
"in
ilton,
Miss
Ryan,
School

made
years
been
ad of
there
entral
into

account); 5 head-mistresses *in charge* of the female department; 2 senior assistants, acting as head-mistresses; 5 assistant teachers (3 male and 2 female), and not less than twenty-two (somewhat more than the "two or three" of Dr. Ryerson) have been appointed to the "subordinate position" of junior assistants and monitor teachers.

From the time the Normal School was first established in 1847, up to December 31st, 1857, the whole number of new appointments has been 73, and of these 42 were Normal School teachers —exclusive of Messrs. Kelly, Coate and Whittemore.

Of the 48 teachers who held office in the course of 1857, twenty-three were Normal School teachers, twenty-five (25) held county board certificates, and of these 6 were trained as teachers in Public Normal Schools in Britain.

And of the staff of teachers employed in the city schools at the present time, namely, altogether 36, there are 18 Normal School teachers and 18 others, of whom, as before mentioned, 6 were trained as teachers in Normal Schools at home.

Having thus disposed, I trust satisfactorily, of the specific charge put forward by Dr. Ryerson—that not one Normal School teacher had been placed "*in charge of a city school*," and only "*two or three employed in subordinate positions*," and having placed plain figures, for the general accuracy of which I am responsible, in contrast with gratuitous assertions, I will submit a few brief observations upon the more general and sweeping accusation that the school authorities of Toronto have "*ignored the Normal School, although established within its limits*"—and I can

affirm, without the possibility of contradiction, that during the whole of my Superintendentship, extending over a period of 14 years, all reasonable deference has been paid to the opinion and recommendation of the Normal School authorities. I can speak of my own knowledge with regard to many appointments to the city schools, which were made wholly upon their recommendation, and to others in which their opinion had much influence; for instance, the 6 new appointments made from '47 to '50, I have already stated, were, in a great measure, based upon the recommendation of the head-master of the Normal School. Mrs. Corbett, the first female teacher employed under the elective board in 1851, and subsequently head mistress "in charge"—first of Louisa-street and then of Phœbe-street school—was appointed upon Dr. Ryerson's own special recommendation. Miss Quinn, "in charge" of the Louisa-street school, owed her appointment to Mr. Robertson's recommendation. Mr. Spotton, "in charge of the Victoria-street school, was indebted to Mr. Ormiston's recommendation. And when the Committee on Appointments had under consideration the selection of a successor to Mr. H. Brown as head-master "in charge" of the Park school, so anxious were they to ensure a good Teacher, that it was decided to accept whomsoever Mr. Robertson and Rev. Mr. Ormiston (of the Normal School) should recommend.—Mr. Kelly was so recommended and appointed accordingly, although, as already stated, that gentleman did not enter upon the duties of the situation.

It is, I am well aware, any thing but a pleasant, and I may add, even a prudent undertaking in an

individual like myself, holding no higher position than that of Local Superintendent, to enter the lists against one so powerful as the Chief Superintendent. I have, on more occasions than one, been exposed to much unmerited obloquy because I was suspected of being adverse to the pretensions of Normal School Teachers; and I have been made to feel that my supposed opposition to Normal School influence, or rather I should say, its domination, has worked harm to my personal interests, and has led to results which a more discreet course on my part might have prevented. Believing, however, that honesty of purpose, and the right of independent judgment, to have been on my side, I have not shrunk at any time from the duty of openly and plainly expressing my official opinion, (when called upon to do so) with regard to School Teachers—based as I have always endeavored it should be, upon the character, the attainments, the experience, and consequently the merits, of an applicant, altogether irrespective of where he or she was educated, or whether a Normal School teacher or not. I have no prejudices, as such, against Normal School Teachers; but I have always resisted their claim to be recognized and treated as having preferential rights over other Teachers. I am the last man in the world to ignore the legitimate claims of the Normal School; but, at the same time, I have no hesitation in stating, that most of the Teachers employed in the City Schools before the Norman School was in existence, were, to say the least, quite as deserving of public confidence, as the majority of those whom the Normal School has sent forth; while, as regards the staff of Teachers now or of

late years employed in our Schools, I could name several whom the Normal School, with all its appliances, could not surpass or perhaps equal.

In a discussion of this kind, when I find myself placed in direct antagonism to the Chief Superintendent, with regard to assertions embodied in an official report, laid before Parliament, and sent forth broadcast through the length and breadth of the Province, I have thought it advisable not to rest the case altogether upon my own statements accurate as I deem them to be, or my own facts, stubborn as I may think them. I therefore directed the attention of Dr. Workman (for many years Chairman of this Board), and of Mr. Lesslie (for many years a member of it) to the Special Report in question; and I submit herewith their statement of facts, as corroborating what I have advanced.

TORONTO, 9TH AUGUST, 1858.

DEAR SIR,

With reference to the passage in the Report of the Chief Superintendent of Education, at page 50, to which you have drawn my attention, and in which it is stated that the Board of Trustees for Toronto "has thought proper to ignore the Normal School, &c., &c." I beg leave, in compliance with your request, to state that during the period in which I had the honour of serving as a member of the Board, comprising several years prior to 1854, no application for the situation of teacher was unfavourably considered, because, of being supported by Normal School testimonials; on the contrary the Board regarded Normal School training as a very important adjunct in the qualification of teachers, though certainly not as substitutive for that solid and well matured education

could name
with all its
equal.
find myself
of Superin-
tended in an
and sent
d breadth
able not to
statements
own facts,
re directed
many years
esslie (for
al Report
statement
dvanced.

r, 1858.
port of the
age 50, to
in which it
ronto "has
chool, &c.,
r request,
I had the
ard, com-
pplication
rably con-
nal School-
arded Nor-
net in the
ot as sub-
education

which is attained in institutions of a different order,
and of merited celebrity, in both the old and new
world.

I have always held the opinion that the Board
acted wisely in seeking the highest possible qualifi-
cation for the services of the City Common Schools ;
and I am convinced that if in any case applicants,
presenting Normal School certificates, were unsuc-
cessful, the simple reason was, that their fortunate
competitors presented still more reliable proofs of
competency.

I have the honour to be
Faithfully yours,

J. WORKMAN, M.D.

G. A. BARBER, Esq., Sec.
B. of C. S., Toronto.

TORONTO, 4TH AUGUST, 1858.

MY DEAR SIR,

In the special Report of the Chief Superintendent
of Education, submitted to the Provincial Legislature
and Government, on the 20th April last, I find allu-
sions made to the School policy and system of
Toronto, which have no foundation in fact, and which,
if a fair specimen of the general accuracy of such
Reports must tend to shake all confidence in them.

In page 50 of that Report I find the following
language :—"Toronto has thought proper to ignore
the Normal School though established within its
limits, and not a Normal School Teacher has been
placed in charge of one of the Common Schools of
the City and only two or three employed in subordinate
positions."

The object intended to be subserved by the above
statement seems to have been to exalt Hamilton at
the expense of Toronto, because the former, the

Report alleges, "furnishes an illustration of the Provincial Normal and Model School system," while the latter, it affirms, affords only an illustration of "*the old system*, except in the character and furniture of the School-houses." This statement also, seems to have been made to meet the objections of a certain writer against the whole School system, "on account of the state (and expensiveness) of the Common Schools of the city of Toronto."

Now, while willing to concede to the Normal and Model School System all the excellence it may reasonably claim, I cannot suppose that any system will be exalted in the estimation of the community by invidious comparisons, and misrepresentations entirely at variance with facts.

The Public Schools of Toronto have had to contend against many antagonistic influences which have retarded their progress and efficiency from the earliest period of their existence, but more particularly since the adoption of *the free principle*; but, I emphatically deny that they have, in any degree, failed in their beneficent design from the causes alleged in the special Report of the Chief Superintendent.

The question of fact, is, whether "Toronto has ignored the Normal Shool," and "has not placed a Normal School Teacher in charge of one of the Public Schools of the City, and has only employed two or three in subordinate positions?" Having for many years taken an active part in the Board of Public School Trustees, in this City, and occupied the place of Chairman of the Committee on appointments to office during the whole period, I believe of my connexion with the City Schools, I give my unhesitating testimony, that, in no instance within my knowledge or recollection, was any teacher who applied for office rejected on the ground of his or her being a Normal School Student, or having only a Normal

of the Problem," while stration of furniture also, seems of a certain on account Common

Normal and e it may ny system community sentations to contend which have the earliest arly since emphatically l in their ed in the nt.

Toronto has t placed a he Public ed two or for many of Public the place tments to my con- esitating knowledge aped for being a Normal

School Certificate. Indeed, so far from this being the case, both the Local Superintendent, Mr. Barber and myself, applied specially, on more occasions than one, to the Head Master Mr. Robertson, and to the Assistant Master Rev. Mr. Ormiston, to obtain, through their recommendation, teachers to fill vacancies in the schools both for Principals and subordinates.

The aim of the Board and Local Superintendent has uniformly been to secure the services of the best qualified persons to fill the important office of teacher, without respect to the source whence the individuals had derived their education; while among the number appointed, since the present school system was established, a large proportion, I believe, will be found, on examination, to have been Normal School Students. It is true that some of our best teachers were not educated at that Institution but held certificates from the most reliable educational authorities in the Mother Country or elsewhere—but this, surely, forms no ground for the allegations contained in the Chief Superintendent's Report.

I am my dear sir,
Yours truly,

J. LESSLIE.

GEO. A. BARBER, Esq., Sec. School Board, Toronto.

Comment upon these facts and figures would be altogether superfluous; they speak plainly enough of themselves; and show most conclusively that, unless the school authorities of Toronto had dismissed old and faithful servants, who had taught in the city schools long before the Normal School was thought of, so as to make way for Normal

School Teachers—or unless they had excluded the claims of many meritorious Teachers who ventured across the Atlantic to find a home, and the equal right of employment in Canada—or unless they had ignored the claims of the training schools of England, Scotland, and Ireland—institutions established and successful years and years before Dr. Ryerson aspired to the office of Chief Superintendent—institions which, it may be safely said possess as much merit and as high a character, if not quite so much pretension, as that in Toronto—unless, I say, these things had been done, and the privileges of the City Board surrendered unconditionally into Dr. Ryerson's hands, so as to have secured for the Normal School Teachers a monopoly of every situation in the City Schools, I really do not understand what more could have been done, or even expected, than the Toronto Board of Trustees have performed in recognizing and availing of the Toronto Normal School.

Having thus shown how partial, how unjust, and I may even say how unfounded has been the uncalled for attack made by the Chief Superintendent upon the School authorities of this city, I leave the Board and the public to form their own further conclusions on the subject.

Respectfully submitted.

G. A. BARBER,
Acting Local Supt.

Toronto, 16th June, 1858.

(*Adopted in Committee of the whole, December 15th, 1858.*)

KEO 771 C35 1858 Suppl. Reserve

